

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

REMARKS

Claims 1-99 are pending, claims 1, 4, 21, 40 and 81 having been previously amended and claims 1, 40, 61 and 81 being presently amended.

The Examiner has indicated differences between Applicant's view of some claims and the Examiner's broadest possible reading. Those claims have been amended as the Examiner implies they should be.

The Examiner replied to Applicants' remarks and the replies are addressed below. Applicants thank the Examiner for clear and thoughtful responses. We hope that the Examiner is persuaded by the following surreply.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claim 61**

The Examiner rejects **claim 61** under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149). As amended, this claim includes the limitations:

a computer, including an electronic mail client having programmatic resources for composing an electronic document having a header and a body, and for sending electronic documents to one or more recipients; and  
programmatic resources coupled with the electronic mail client in the computer which ...

These limitations are not found in Ohmura, because, as the Examiner points out, Ohmura is coupled to a user that identifies data to select, instead of using a program for the identification.

Therefore, claim 61 should be allowable over Ohmura.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 1, 40, and 81**

The Examiner rejects **claims 1, 40, and 81** under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149). These amended claims include the limitations such as found in claim 1:

processing the electronic document using a program to automatically identify semantic foci

The automatic processing limitation is not found in Ohmura, because, as the Examiner points out, the user in Ohmura identifies data, instead of a program doing so.

Therefore, claims 1, 40, and 81 should be allowable over Ohmura.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 3, 22, 43, 63 and 83**

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 22, 43, 63 and 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149). Considering the Examiner's comments about at what point in processing an e-mail is involved, we point out that these claims provide two antecedent references: "the electronic document" which is being processed to automatically identify semantic foci; and "an enhanced document" that results from the processing, before output. The claims clearly state that the electronic document which the program automatically processes to identify semantic foci is an e-mail. An output document might correspond to the claimed enhanced document or something later in processing. It is clear from Ohmura that the document on which the user operates to manually select data is a web page, not an e-mail.

Therefore, claims 3, 22, 43, 63 and 83 should be allowable over Ohmura.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 4, 23, 44, 64 and 83**

The Examiner rejects claims 4, 23, 44, 64 and 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Fujii (USPN 6,253,231 B1). In this section, the Examiner addresses combining the references.

Applicants believe that the Examiner has confused the positions taken with a similar sounding but much different legal principle. The Examiner has characterized Applicants' position as combining Ohmura with Fujii would render Ohmura unsuitable for operation. The Applicant's position is different: The Examiner's combination of Ohmura and Fujii would improperly render Ohmura unsuitable for its intended purpose and change its principle of operation. "A proposed modification should not 'destroy a reference' by rendering the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1 127 (Fed. Cir. 1984)." Barry R.A. Weinhardt, M. Reinhart, *Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 Basic Student's Manual*, p. 24 (U.S. P.T.O. Office of Patent Policy Dissemination, Rev. 4 1998). Combining the references would change the basic principle of operation in Ohmura. "As a proposed modification or combination of the prior art should not destroy a reference, the proposed modification or combination should not change the principle of operation of the reference. *In re Ratti*, 270 F. 2d 810, 813, 123 USPQ 349, 352 (CCPA 1959). This is true even if the combination proposed is operative." Barry et al., *Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103, supra*, pp. 25-26; explaining, M.P.E.P. 2143.01.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

The difference between is that the Patent Academy teaches examiners that Applicants' argument is persuasive even if the combination proposed is operative. The Examiner's response is that it would be completely feasible to combine the reference. But this misses the point. Even if the Examiner is right and the combination would be feasible, the combination is not a proper basis for a section 103(a) rejection if it renders Ohmura unsuitable for its intended purpose or the combination changes Ohmura's original principle of operation.

Any modification of Ohmura to convert the image data extracted from the web page from an "index sticker" to HTML, as in Fujii, would be improper because it would render the Ohmura reference unsuitable for its intended purpose of providing a separate, trackable index sticker object that has the same appearance as the web page. Placing the web page extract into an HTML e-mail document as in Fujii would improperly change the Ohmura's principle of operation by eliminating the separate "index sticker" object that Ohmura tracks through forwarding of e-mail. This would change the basic principle of operation in Ohmura.

The Examiner's statement of motivation does not meet the evidentiary standards set by MPEP § 2143.01 and *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-44, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-34 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (discussing the importance of relying on objective evidence and making specific factual findings with respect to the motivation to combine references). The Examiner says that a particular motivation would have been apparent to one of skill in the art. This statement effectively admits that there is no objective evidence in either of the references of a teaching or suggestion to combine. The Examiner's other choice is to supply an affidavit of his personal knowledge as to what would be obvious. MPEP § 2144.03, provides guidance as to what more the Examiner must provide:

If the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position.

When a rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of the examiner, the data should be stated as specifically as possible, and the facts must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit from the examiner. Such an affidavit is subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

An affidavit is particularly appropriate in this case where combination of very dissimilar technologies is proposed. Either words in the references or an Examiner's affidavit can

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

be offered as evidence of motivation to combine; conjecture is not enough to satisfy the MPEP or Federal Circuit.

Therefore, claims 4, 23, 44, 64 and 83 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Fujii.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 5, 45 and 65**

The Examiner rejects claims 5, 45 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Hong et al. (USPN 5,710,883). This rejection tracks the rejection discussed above of claims 3, 22, 43, 63 and 83. As we stated above, considering the Examiner's comments about at what point in processing an e-mail is involved, we point out that these claims provide two antecedent references: "the electronic document" which is being processed to automatically identify semantic foci; and "an enhanced document" that results from the processing, before output. The claims clearly state that the electronic document which the program automatically processes to identify semantic foci is an e-mail. An output document might correspond to the claimed enhanced document or something later in processing. It is clear from Ohmura that the document on which the user operates to manually select data is a web page, not an e-mail.

Therefore, claims 5, 45 and 65 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Hong et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 6, 8, 25, 27, 46, 48, 66, 68, 85 and 87**

The Examiner rejects claims 6, 8, 25, 27, 46, 48, 66, 68, 85 and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Sheffield (USPN 5,566,330). These claims include the limitations related to a temporal relationship between the document date and the at least one other date, which we call "temporal proximity." Dates that closely match the target date may be one color and dates further away another color. This is different from color-coding the dates on some arbitrary basis. Temporal proximity coding is not found in Ohmura in view of Sheffield.

It appears that the Examiner understands that the claimed limitations are missing from the cited references, as the Examiner argues, "Even if the limitations ... are missing, they are clear, obvious extensions to what is already there." Again, the under MPEP § 2143.01, *In re Lee*, and MPEP § 2144.03, the Examiner needs to find evidence in the references or supply an affidavit.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

When the Examiner is considering asserting obviousness beyond the features in cited references, some legal principles should be kept in mind. To extend a Section 103 rejection beyond the features of the cited references, the Examiner needs to provide evidence of a teaching or suggestion to extend the references to include the claimed features that are admittedly missing. It is fundamental, as indicated in MPEP § 2143.01, that the Examiner rely on some evidentiary quality suggestion to modify the proposed combination:

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also >*In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-44, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-34 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (discussing the importance of relying on objective evidence and making specific factual findings with respect to the motivation to combine references); <*In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

This section of the MPEP cites *In re Lee*, in which the Federal Circuit clarified the need for evidentiary quality support of an Examiner's factual basis for finding a teaching, suggestion or motivation in the prior art (as opposed to the Examiner's opinion), 277 F.3d at 1343-44:

As applied to the determination of patentability *vel non* when the issue is obviousness, "it is fundamental that rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 must be based on evidence comprehended by the language of that section." *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 739, 218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 769, 775 (Fed. Cir. 1983). ... "The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching." *Id.* It must be based on objective evidence of record. This precedent has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with. [citation omitted] The need for specificity pervades this authority. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed"); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("even when the level of skill in the art is high, the Board must identify specifically the principle, known to one of ordinary skill, that suggests the

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

claimed combination. In other words, the Board must explain the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious."); *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (the examiner can satisfy the burden of showing obviousness of the combination "only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references"). ... In its decision on Lee's patent application, the Board rejected the need for "any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference" to support the combination of the Nortrup and Thunderchopper references. Omission of a relevant factor required by precedent is both legal error and arbitrary agency action.

The outcome of cases decided even before *In re Lee* makes it clear that real evidence is required to support an asserted teaching, suggestion or motivation to extend references to features missing from the references, for an obviousness rejection. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1369-70 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (rev'd finding of obviousness, as "Even when obviousness is based on a single prior art reference, there must be a showing of a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of that reference."); *Kolmes v. World Fibers Corp.*, 107 F.3d 1534, 1541 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (aff'd patent not invalid, as no suggestion to modify the '989 patent with regard to non-metallic fibers).

Just saying "it's obvious" is an exercise of hindsight that doesn't meet the legal requirements for evidentiary support.

Therefore, claims 6, 8, 25, 27, 46, 48, 66, 68, 85 and 87 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Sheffield.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 7, 26, 47, 67 and 86**

The Examiner rejects **claims 7, 26, 47, 67 and 86** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Sheffield (USPN 5,566,330) in further view of Doerre et al (USPN 6,446,061). These claims further extend temporal proximity by requiring conversion of a date to canonical form.

Doerre et al. does not teach extracting dates from images, as opposed to text. There is a gap between input that Ohmura supplies and processing that Doerre et al. teaches. The gap requires another reference or an Examiner's affidavit of personal knowledge.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 26, 47, 67 and 86 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Sheffield in further view of Doerre et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 11, 28, 51, 71 and 90**

The Examiner rejects claims 11, 28, 51, 71 and 90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Doerre et al. (USPN 6,446,061). The comments above regarding image output from Ohmura and a need for text input to Doerre et al. apply as strongly to currency as to dates.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 28, 51, 71 and 90 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Sheffield in further view of Doerre et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 10, 50, 70 and 89**

The Examiner rejects claims 10, 50, 70 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Doerre et al. (USPN 6,446,061). The Examiner considers an index sticker to be a collection that could be converted to a sortable list. First, Ohmura has an unusual usage of the term "index sticker". An index sticker does not include a list of entries typically found in an index. In col. 6, lines 3-4, Ohmura describes an index sticker as "index information consisting of image data and address information". The image data is the material extracted by manual rubber banding (col. 15, lines 26-34) and the address information is a URI (similar to a URL). *Id.* Second, none of the cited references convert image stickers to sortable lists. The possibility of doing so is not evidence that it was obvious. Even if image stickers were converted to lists, that would not give them a plurality of types or supply the limitation of sorting the index stickers by type. In Ohmura, index stickers are of just one type, so it makes no sense to sort them by type.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 50, 70 and 89 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Doerre et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 12, 29, 52, 72 and 91**

The Examiner rejects claims 12, 29, 52, 72 and 91 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Logan et al. (USPN 5,732,216).

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

Just saying that the motivation "is to allow helpful commentary; such commentary would be allow useful information to be attached to the index stickers" is not evidence sufficient to satisfy MPEP § 2143.01, *In re Lee*, or MPEP § 2144.03.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12, 29, 52, 72 and 91 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Logan et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 13, 30, 53, 73 and 92**

The Examiner rejects claims 13, 30, 53, 73 and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Yue (USPN 6,457,143).

Perhaps Applicants stated their position inartfully. What we meant to point out is that there is nothing in Ohmura that qualifies as semantic foci that are assigned a plurality of types. Ohmura's index stickers consist of image data and URIs, without typing that could be color coded. There is a gap between the output of Ohmura and the claimed structures to which color coding applies, which the Examiner cannot satisfy by combining Ohmura with Yue. There is nothing in Ohmura's index stickers to which color coding can be applied as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 30, 53, 73 and 92 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Yue.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 14, 31, 54, 74 and 93**

The Examiner rejects claims 14, 31, 54, 74 and 93 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Dooley (USPN 5, 893,916). As 8 p.m. approaches for the undersigned, we appreciate the sense of both the Examiner and Applicants reasserting their prior positions regarding these claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14, 31, 54, 74 and 93 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Dooley.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 15, 34, 55, 75 and 94**

The Examiner rejects claims 15, 34, 55, 75 and 94 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Irons (USPN 6,192,165). These claims should be patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 16, 35, 56, 76 and 95**

The Examiner rejects claims 16, 35, 56, 76 and 95 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Horvitz et al. (USPN 6,161,130). For this rejection, it is again critical to have in mind the difference between whether a combination is operative and whether it improperly either renders a reference unsuitable for its intended purpose or changes the references principle of operation, regardless of whether it is operative. See Barry et al., Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103, *supra*, pp. 24-26; explaining, M.P.E.P. 2143.01. The Examiner's proposed combination of Ohmura with Horvitz et al. ignores the intended purpose of Ohmura and confuses the claimed invention with a spam checker. Again, Ohmura analyzes web pages. Checking an e-mail attachment for spam involves different principles of operation than manual extraction of images from web pages. Ohmura's output is so different from Horvitz et al.'s input that there is nothing in Ohmura that could be considered an attachment. Nor does spam checking satisfy the limitation, "said processing".

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 35, 56, 76 and 95 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Horvitz et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 17, 36, 57, 77 and 96**

The Examiner rejects claims 17, 36, 57, 77 and 96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view of Kesel (USPN 6,026,387).

The output of Ohmura, an image and a URI, cannot be used as input to Kesel's summarization. Maybe the Examiner wants to patch a reference between Ohmura and Kesel, but an important piece is missing and there is no evidentiary quality support for the asserted motivation to combine.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17, 36, 57, 77 and 96 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Kesel et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 18, 37, 58, 78 and 97**

The Examiner rejects claims 18, 37, 58, 78 and 97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Nelson (USPN 6,032,132). For this rejection, it is again critical to have in mind the difference between whether a combination is operative and whether it improperly either renders a reference unsuitable for its intended purpose or changes the references principle of operation, regardless of whether it is operative. See Barry et al., Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103, *supra*, pp.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

24-26; explaining, M.P.E.P. 2143.01. The Examiner's proposed combination of Ohmura with Nelson ignores the intended purpose of Ohmura and confuses the claimed invention with a billing system. Again, Ohmura analyzes web pages. Generating summary telecom billing information (in Nelson, col. 11, lines 15-65) does not apply to images and URIs selected from web pages. Ohmura's output is so different from Horvitz et al.'s input that there is nothing in Ohmura that could be effectively summarized applying Nelson's accounting-related technology.

The Examiner has not provided evidentiary quality support to motivate combining the references, however that combination is envisioned.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18, 37, 58, 78 and 97 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Nelson.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 19, 38, 59, 79 and 98**

Claims 19, 38, 59, 79 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmura, further in view of Kupiec (USP 6,533,822). These claims include limitations such as:

wherein said header includes text suggesting a key subject, and including generating a summary of said electronic document based upon the key subject, and including the summary in the enhanced document

In claim 1, the antecedent reference to "said header" is "the electronic document including a header and a body." Ohmura as input to Kupiec does not include a "header [that] includes text suggesting a key subject. All that Ohmura includes is image data and a URI. Ohmura does not provide a scanable header to which Kupiec might be applied. Nor is summarization of image data taught by the cited references.

Therefore, claims 19, 38, 59, 79 and 98 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Kupiec.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 20, 39, 60, 80 and 99**

The Examiner rejects claims 20, 39, 60, 80 and 99 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Sotomayor (USPN 5,708,825), without applying Kessel [sic]. Ohmura treats the extracted web page section as image data and Sotomayor requires text from which to prepare a summary. In col. 6, lines 3-4, Ohmura describes an index sticker as "index information consisting of image data and address information". The image data is the material extracted by manual rubber

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

banding (col. 15, lines 26-34) and the address information is a URI (similar to a URL). *Id.* There is no teaching in Ohmura to extract text, either from a header or from the body of the document, which could be used as input to Sotomayor.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20, 39, 60, 80 and 99 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Sotomayor.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 24 and 84**

The Examiner rejects claims 24 and 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Hong (USPN 5,710,873). The Examiner's rejection of these claims incorporates by reference rejections of claims 4/23 and 5/24. This response provides substantial additional discussion of the Examiner arguments incorporated by reference.

Accordingly, reconsideration of rejected claims 24 and 84 is respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 32**

The Examiner rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Welti et al. (USPN 5,696,539).

Welti, as a whole and with particular attention to col. 6, provides a color management system for visually consistent display of an on multiple displays that have different color processing capabilities. Accordingly, Welti's "present invention [] translate[s] the pixel into a matching color within the visual type of the receiver." Col. 6, lines 17-19. This has nothing to do with semantic foci types, which are referred to in the claim.

As described above, Ohmura does not include a plurality of codable types of semantic foci. (Nor does it include semantic foci.) An index sticker consists of image data and a URI. It makes no sense to color code image data or a URI by semantic foci type, as claimed. There is no concept in Ohmura or Welti of extracting semantic foci, so the combination cannot supply the missing element.

The Examiner has not provided evidentiary quality support to motivate combining the references, which are from different fields of endeavor—on-screen color management vs manual capture of partial screen images and tracking of e-mail conveying the captured excerpts.

Application No. 09/767,810

Atty Docket No. INXT 1014-1

The Examiner has not provided evidentiary quality support to motivate combining the references, however that combination is envisioned.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 32 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Welti et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 33**

The Examiner rejects claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ohmura (USPN 6,138,149) in view Eick (USPN 5,644,692). This claim includes the limitations:

adding presentation attributes to entries in said meta-content index within one of said plurality of types, according to relationships among said entries within said one of said plurality of types

These limitations are not found in Ohmura in view of Eick. No matter how sophisticated the operations of Eick, the data of Ohmura is too simple to meet the claimed limitations. The only two entities in Ohmura are part of an index sticker are the image data and the URI. This is not the character of data to which adapt Eick's display technology applies.

The Examiner has not provided evidentiary quality support to motivate combining the references, however that combination is envisioned.

Therefore, claim 33 should be allowable over Ohmura in view of Eick.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and thereby solicit acceptance of the claims, in light of these amendments.

The undersigned can ordinarily be reached at his office at (650) 712-0340 from 8:30 to 5:30 PST, M-F and can be reached at his cell phone (415) 902-6112 most other times.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Ernest J. Beffel, Jr., Reg. No. 43,489

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P.O. Box 366  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
(650) 712-0340 phone  
(650) 712-0263 fax